

Juvenile Continuity of Care Task Force
Colorado Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice
Minutes

September 12, 1:30PM-4:30PM
710 Kipling Street, 3rd floor conference room, Lakewood

ATTENDEES:

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

Robert Werthwein, CDHS, Office of Children, Youth and Families
Susan Colling, State Court Administrators' Office, Division of Probation Services
Bill Kilpatrick, Golden Police Department
Bill Delisio, Colorado Judicial Branch, Family Law Program
Mike Tessean, Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center, S.B. 94
Dan Makelky, County Human Services
Meg Williams, Division of Criminal Justice
Kelly Friesen, Grand County Juvenile Justice Department & S.B. 94, 14th Judicial District (on the phone)
Shawn Cohn, Denver Juvenile Probation

ABSENT

Angela Brant, Colorado Public Defender
Sheri Danz, Colorado Office of Child's Representative
Charles Parkins, CDHS, Division of Youth Corrections
Rebecca Gleason, 18th Judicial, DA's office

STAFF

Richard Stroker/CCJJ consultant
Kim English/Division of Criminal Justice
Laurence Lucero/Division of Criminal Justice

GUESTS

Craig McPherson, Jefferson County JAC	Gretchen Russo, CDHS, OCYF
Roger Low, Governor's Office, OSPB	Peg Flick, DCJ
Mallory Nassau, State Court Administrator's Office	Trevor Williams, CDHS, DCW (on the phone)
Tiffany Sewell, CDHS, DCW	Skip Barber, CAFCA
Alison Young, State Court Administrator's Office	

<p>Issue/Topic: Welcome and Introductions</p>	<p>Robert Werthwein welcomed the group and thanked members and guests for attending.</p> <p>The members of the Task Force and guests introduced themselves.</p> <p>Robert Werthwein reminded the group that due to the number of absentees at the August’s meeting, the group had not reach a quorum to vote on the July meeting minutes. A motion and a second were made to approve the minutes. All voted in favor. The minutes of July 11, 2016 meeting were approved.</p> <p>A motion and a second were made to approve the minutes of the August 8, 2016 meeting. All voted in favor. The minutes of August 8, 2016 were approved.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic: Presentation: Jefferson County JAC referrals to Human Services</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Craig McPherson offered a presentation to the group on the partnership between the Jefferson County Juvenile Assessment Center (JCJAC) and the Department of Human Services (DHS).</p> <p>The full power point presentation can be found at http://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccjj/Committees/JCCTF/Handout/2016-09-12-JCJACs_Referrals_DHS.pdf</p> <p>Highlights of presentation:</p> <p>Mr. McPherson started his presentation by explaining that there is a gap in the data due to the information management system at the JAC and so he was unable to collect data of the number of youth who are served at the JCJAC and have an open case with DHS.</p> <p>Mr. Tessean added that the JCJAC is planning on updating its information management system so these numbers can be collected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2015, the JCJAC implemented a “Frequent Flyer” program with the intent to reduce recidivism and address the workload that the youth who come back more than 2 times represent for the case managers at the JCJAC. • For the youth (n=57) who had two referrals within the year, the JCJAC meets with families and juveniles to identify the barriers that prevented the success of the services (for example: referral not appropriate, services too far for the families, too costly, etc.). • For the youth (n=37) who had three referrals within the year, the JCJAC contacts DHS to facilitate a meeting with youth and families and agree on the level of care without opening a DHS case. Those youth are not involved in the criminal justice and came to the JCJAC for the following circumstances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beyond Control of Parent (BCOP) • Curfew • Runaway • High risk for victimization • School Behaviors

- Welfare Placement

Some discussion points from the presentation are outlined below.

How many of the youth who have come to the JAC just one time end up to DHS or a different route? The number is unknown as the JCJAC does not conduct follow-up searches on the youth who just came one time at the JAC.

It was suggested that it would be valuable to find out if the youth have received services from other entities and whether those services had outcomes on the youth.

It would also be interesting to see what services overlap between counties and how counties share information on the treatments or services that worked.

Craig McPherson described the process of the “Frequent Flyer Red Team”. When there is a report of child abuse and neglect, the JCJAC team contacts DHS who will determine whether a case will be open. If the case doesn’t meet the criteria, it goes back to the Frequent Flyer program at the JAC. At this point, the JAC, DHS and any other participating agency will meet with the youth and family to identify issues and agree on a treatment plan.

Shawn Cohn commented that it was very challenging for probation officers to obtain case plan information especially when there is an open D&N case. Without the case plan information, the probation officers often develop their own individual case plans and families end up with multiple case plans between Probation and DHS.

Issue/Topic:

Presentation: Crossover model
Action:

A brief history of Crossover Youth Practice Model (CYPM) in Colorado was provided by Gretchen Russo who indicated that the early efforts of CYPM started in Denver in 2010.

Mallory Nassau presented on the Crossover Youth Practice Model and explained how the Court Improvement Program (CIP) and the Colorado Department of Human Services (CDHS) partnered in efforts to implement CYPM.

Full presentation can be found at <http://cdpsdocs.state.co.us/ccij/Committees/JCCTF/Handout/2016-09-12-CYPM.pdf>

Highlights of the presentation:

- The Crossover Youth Practice Model was developed in 2010 by the Center for Juvenile Justice Reform at Georgetown University to address the unique needs of youth who fluctuate between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems. These youth are commonly referred to as “crossover youth.”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives of the model are to reduce the number of youth who crossover between the child welfare and juvenile justice systems; to reduce the number of youth entering and reentering care and; to reduce the length of stay in out of home care. • There are 5 key components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Creating processes to identify the crossover youth, - Ensuring that workers are sharing information in a timely manner, - Including families in all aspects of decision-making for the case, - Ensuring that unified care/case planning is occurring at the point of detention or disposition. - Maximizing the services utilized by each system to prevent youth from crossing over. • Colorado started implementing the first CYPMs in 2010 with the technical assistance of Georgetown University. The initial pilot sites were Alamosa County, Broomfield County, Denver County, Douglas County, Gunnison County, Larimer County, Mesa County and Morgan County. • In 2014, the contract ended with Georgetown University and the pilot sites continued implementing the model. In an effort to continue assisting and supporting the CYPM sites, Mallory Nassau and Tiffany Sewell have worked on several measures such as the <i>Best Business Practice CYPM Event Code</i> (a handout was provided to the group). The <i>CYPM Event Code</i> has been developed for judicial districts to help identify crossover youth. • The CIP and CDHS recently conducted a survey to assess the implementation of the model and the needs of those pilot sites. The survey suggested the creation of a CYPM community as a way to stay in touch with other sites. Another highlight of survey was that many of the existing sites were willing to be mentor to other sites and share information that were instrumental in the implementation of the model (MOUs, manuals etc.). • There is an ongoing interest and a number of counties have expressed interest in implementing a crossover youth model. • Mallory Nassau encouraged the Task Force to collaborate in this effort and proposed the development of a statewide team that would develop a sustainability plan. • With regards to the sustainability plan, Ms. Nassau recommended the creation of a state oversight committee that would assist with issues of sustainability, implementation, expansion, communication between sites, quality assurance, technical assistance, data, information sharing and education. The agencies represented in such committee would be: CIP, CDHS, Collaborative Management, Juvenile Probation, Education, Behavioral Health, Office of the Child Representative, Judicial, District Attorney’s Office, Public Defender’s Office and Law Enforcement.
--	---

	<p>Mallory concluded her presentation by expressing hope that this Task Force will consider partnering in these efforts and will send Gretchen Russo a proposal to forward to the group should this Task Force decides to participate.</p> <p>Some discussion points from the presentation are outlined below.</p> <p><i>Is this model targeting exclusively youth who have D&N case and crossover the juvenile system?</i> It was commented that the majority of youth actually cross the other direction, from the juvenile justice to the out-of-placement through Child Welfare (CW).</p> <p>Ms. Sewell responded that each county has developed and adapted their own model based on the population they serve and that a model can look very different in different counties.</p> <p><i>Is there any data on how effective these models are?</i> The models are being evaluated and data is being collected. In Douglas County, the number of youth in congregate care has been reduced substantially since the implementation of the crossover youth model.</p> <p>There should be some guidelines on how case workers and probation officers work in partnership on a case. For Ms. Cohn, the purpose of this Task Force is to prevent youth from penetrating the system, determine a system to work together better, provide community level services so youth are not placed in congregate care.</p> <p>Ms. Sewell suggested that such model is not inherent in all counties across the state like in Denver. The goal of the CYPM is to ensure integrated treatment plan for youth who are dually-system involved with specific steps and standards so youth do not have multiple plans that could conflict. It is important to ensure that there is communication between systems and with the families.</p> <p>It was noted that education on adolescent brain development, child trauma and juvenile-specific training are lacking in the juvenile justice arena and courses on crossover youth should be enhanced.</p> <p>Judges can decide to put JV and JD cases on the same dockets and order the counties to share information.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Discussion and clarification of primary areas of focus</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Richard Stroker reminded that the group agreed that the focus of this Task Force is <i>“The effective use of information, resources and approaches among several agencies in order to achieve desired outcome for dually-status youth”</i>.</p> <p>Two broad issues were identified as follows:</p> <p>Issue 1. Need overarching system approach to solve systematic problems and implement prevention methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Absence of standard protocols - Data is not integrated

- Systems are not linked
- No collaborative case management system
- Different outcomes different counties

Issue: 2. Coordinated case management system – not in place.

- What works best for adolescents?
- Who is involved and When?
- Are there successful models that could be embraced/expanded?
- Training

Richard proposed that at future meetings, the group start outlining a juvenile system map for dually identified youth with the different intercepts of the system.

DISCUSSIONS

Susan Colling remembered that such map has been prepared at the previous Juvenile Justice Task Force. Kim English and Laurence Lucero will gather and include the document in the TF meeting materials when the TF is ready to engage these discussions.

It was suggested that all members discuss and agree on the common goals and outcomes of this task force as some goals may conflict directly with their departments own goals.

Richard Stroker concurred that the group should establish the philosophy and direction of this Task Force and identify common objectives (for example: public safety, evidence-based-practices approaches, continuity of care and prevention to not penetrate further into the system in the least intrusive manner).

Shawn Cohn discussed the use of the Colorado Juvenile Risk Assessment (CJRA) and reminded that judges have discretion to send juveniles on probation to the Division of Youth Corrections (DYC) and added that practices vary considerably from one jurisdiction to another. It was noted that the issue of resources and the lack of alternative placement availability in some counties often result of a youth being committed to DYC. Shawn further explained that there are variables in different counties that determine whether a youth is committed to DYC or placed by Human Services (when the youth remain on probation with a case worker). These variables are often resources driven.

For many of the youth who are in DYC or DHS, the services provided are the same. *Shouldn't the funds be comingled to ensure coordinated care?* DYC and HS are under the same department but funded differently.

Richard Stroker responded that this discussion is documented and will be re-visited when the group engages discussions on the solutions.

	<p>Richard asked the Task Force members if sub-groups should be created to discuss the two issues or should the Task Force tackle these issues during meetings. The group agreed on tackling the issues at the Task Force level and not creating working groups at this time.</p> <p>One obvious gap is that there are some jurisdictions engaged in crossover youth discussions but not all jurisdictions. It is important to ensure that all counties are informed of those efforts so they join in the statewide goals of coordinating care for dually-involved youth.</p> <p>Robert Werthwein suggested that this Task Force should mandate the development of a crossover youth model or the basic components of a crossover youth model across jurisdictions. Robert added that the elements that could be barriers to the development of such crossover youth model be identified and addressed (for example access to treatment information, data sharing, funding, etc.).</p> <p>Shawn Cohn asked “<i>why do the youth have to be dually-involved</i>”? The D&N children represent a small number of the crossover youth but the question should be: why does probation request placement on such large number of youth? In Denver, more than half of youth on Probation also have a case worker and almost all of the youth that have a multi-disciplinary staffing (DCP) have a PO and a case worker. It would be interesting to know how many children who are on Probation have an open case with DHS. Shawn recently attended a presentation provided by NYC where she learned that 50%-55% of the youth at NYC had been in 3 out-of-home placements prior to going to NYC.</p> <p>It was mentioned that, often times and in some jurisdictions, law enforcement officers have to go to homes multiple times and eventually, the youth is arrested and charged so he/she can get services. In Douglas County, the Family Pavilion was created to address this issue and serve youth before penetration in the juvenile justice system.</p>
<p>Issue/Topic:</p> <p>Next Steps Adjourn</p> <p>Action:</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <p>Richard Stroker proposed that the group discuss the following topics at the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overarching goals - Components of an “ideal crossover model” - Obvious or significant barriers to achieving “ideal” model - Targets of change <p>Group discussed the importance to ensure full attendance at the next JCC TF and due to the number of anticipated absentees, the meeting on October 3 is cancelled. Laurence Lucero will submit to the group tentative dates to reschedule the October meeting.</p>

	Robert thanked the group. The meeting adjourned at 4:25 pm
--	--

Next Meeting

November, 7 11:00pm – 4:30pm Location: 710 Kipling St., Lakewood Colorado